

No. 9/9/86-6Lab/3397.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Special Machine, Kunjpura Road, Bye Pass, Karnal:—

**BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 12 of 1985

between

**THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SPECIAL MACHINE, KUNJPURA ROAD, BYE P.
KARNAL AND ITS WORKMEN.**

Present:—

None.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the Management of M/s. Special Machine, Kunjpura Road, Bye Pass, Karnal and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

- (1) Whether all the workmen of the factory are entitled to attendance cards ? If so, with what details ?
- (2) Whether the workmen of the factory are entitled to the post and grade according to the post on which they work? If so, with what details?
- (3) Whether the workmen of the factory are entitled to night allowance at the rate of Rs. 50 per month? If so, with what details?

2. Notice were issued to both the parties. It may be mentioned that on the last date of hearing, none appeared on behalf of both the parties even though they were presented previously and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against both the parties. It appears that both the parties are not interested in the reference. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 2nd April, 1986

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 250, dated 2nd April, 1986

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/9/86-6 Lab./3407.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act' 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Rawal Industries Pvt. Ltd., Bahadurgarh:—

**BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 2/1986

between

**THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. RAWAL INDUSTRIES PVT. LTD., BAHADURGARH
AND ITS WORKMEN**

Present:—

None.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the Management of M/s Rawal Industries Pvt. Ltd., Bahadurgarh and its workmen, to this Tribunal for adjudication :--

- (1) Whether the workmen of the establishment are entitled to quarter allowance of Rs. 60/- per month ? If so, with what details ?
- (2) Whether the workmen of the establishment are entitled to two uniforms and two pairs of shoes according to season ? If so, with what details ?
- (3) Whether the workmen of the establishment are entitled to the production Bonus for the years 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85 ? If so, with what details ?

2. Notices were issued to both the parties. It may be mentioned that on the last date of hearing none appeared on behalf of the workmen and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the workmen. The registered notice of the Management had not been received back and the presumption, therefore, is that the Management had been duly served. None was present on behalf of the Management and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the Management. It appears that both the parties are not interested in the reference. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated : 2nd April, 1986.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 258, dated 3rd April, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R.N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/9/86-6Lab./3406.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s M. D., Haryana State Minor Irrigation Tubewell Corporation, Chandigarh, (2) Executive Engineer, Haryana State Minor Irrigation Tubewell Corporation Workshop, Karnal :--

BEFORE R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 43/1985

Between

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S M. D., HARYANA STATE MINOR IRRIGATION TUBEWELL CORPORATION, CHANDIGARH (2) EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, HARYANA STATE MINOR IRRIGATION TUBEWELL CORPORATION WORKSHOP, KARNAL AND ITS WORKMAN

Present :—

None.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the the Management of M/s M. D.. Haryana State Minor Irrigation Tubewell Corporation, Chandigarh (2) Executive Engineer, Haryana State Minor Irrigation Tubewell Corporation Workshop, Karnal and its workmen, to this Tribunal for adjudication :--

Whether the workmen Shri Tahar Singh, T. Mate is entitled to promotion on the basis of seniority from the date on which the officials junior to him have been promoted ? If so, with what details ?

2. Notices were issued to both the parties. It may be mentioned that on the last date of hearing, none appeared on behalf of the Management even though they were represented previously and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against them. The workman had already been proceeded *ex parte* on 19th February, 1986. It appears that both the parties are not interested in the reference. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 2nd April, 1986

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst No. 257, Dated the 3rd April, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R.N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/9/86-6Lab. 3564.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/S. K. S. and Company, E-32, Industrial Area, Sonepat :—

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 15/1985

Between

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S K. S. AND COMPANY, E-32, INDUSTRIAL AREA, SONEPAT
AND ITS WORKMEN

Present—

None.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the Management of M/s K. S. and Company, E-32, Industrial Area, Sonepat and its workmen, to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

- (1) Whether the workmen are entitled to two pairs of shoes, two pairs of uniforms annually and are also entitled to good quality of jersey in winter season ? If so, with what details ?
- (2) Whether all the workmen are entitled to attendance cards and identity cards ? If so, with what details ?
- (3) Whether the workman who was sent on tour was entitled to daily allowance at the rate of Rs. 20 ? If so, with what details ?
- (4) Whether the worker who was given the amount in advance was entitled to get any document as a proof ? If so, with what details ?
- (5) Whether the worker who had completed 90 days attendance was entitled to be confirmed immediately ? If so, with what details ?

2. Notices were issued to both the parties. It may be mentioned that on the last date of hearing none was present on behalf of the workmen even though they were presented previously and as such

ex parte proceedings were ordered against the workmen. The management had already been proceeded *ex parte* on 27th September, 1985. It appears that both the parties are not interested in the reference. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 8th April, 1986.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 270, dated the 8th April, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

KULWANT SINGH,
Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Labour and Employment Department.

श्रम विभाग

आदेश

दिनांक 4 जून, 1986

सं. ग्रोवि०/अम्बला/63-86/19035.—चूकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल की राय है कि मैं वी०ड० जगत्ता० १५ कम्पनी बंगली मोहल्ला, 2557/16, अम्बला कैन्ट, के श्रमिक श्री नन्द किशोर तथा उसके प्रबन्धकों के मध्य इसमें इसके बाद लिखित मामले में कोई औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और चूकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल विवाद को न्यायनिर्णय हेतु निर्दिष्ट करना बांधनीय समझते हैं ;

इसलिए, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947, की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) द्वारा प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल इसके द्वारा सरकारी अधिसूचना सं. 3(4) 84-3-श्रम, दिनांक 18 अप्रैल, 1985, द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, अम्बला, को विवादग्रस्त या उससे सम्बन्धित नीचे लिखा मामला न्यायनिर्णय एवं पंचाट तीन मास में देने हेतु निर्दिष्ट करते हैं जो कि उक्त प्रबन्धकों तथा श्रमिक के बीच या तो विवादग्रस्त मामला है या विवाद से सुसंगत अथवा सम्बन्धित मामला है :—

क्या श्री नन्द किशोर, पुत्र श्री रामलाल की सेवाओं का समापन न्यायोचित तथा ठीक है ? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस राहत का हकदार है ?

सं. ग्रोवि०/एफ.डी./54-86/19125.—चूकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल की राय है कि मैं विविध पीली पैकेजिंग, 14/7, मथुरा रोड, फरीदाबाद, के श्रमिक श्री कमलेश गुप्ता, मार्फत राष्ट्रीय मजदूर सभा, संघर्ष यूनियन (रजि०) प्लाट तं० ए-408, टूल रूम ट्रेनिंग सेंटर के सामने औद्योगिक क्षेत्र, दिल्ली-110052, तथा उसके प्रबन्धकों के मध्य इसमें इसके बाद लिखित मामले में कोई औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और चूकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल विवाद को न्यायनिर्णय हेतु निर्दिष्ट करना बांधनीय समझते हैं ;

इसलिए, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947, की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) द्वारा प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल इसके द्वारा सरकारी अधिसूचना सं. 5415-3 श्रम/68/15254, दिनांक 20 जून, 1978, के साथ पढ़ते हुए अधिसूचना सं. 11495-जी-श्रम/57/11245, दिनांक 7 फरवरी, 1958, द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, फरीदाबाद, को विवादग्रस्त या उससे सुसंगत या उससे सम्बन्धित नीचे लिखा मामला न्यायनिर्णय एवं पंचाट तीन मास में देने हेतु निर्दिष्ट करते हैं जोकि उक्त प्रबन्धकों तथा श्रमिक के बीच या तो विवादग्रस्त मामला है या उससे सुसंगत अथवा सम्बन्धित मामला है :—

क्या कमलेश गुप्ता, की सेवाओं का समापन न्यायोचित तथा ठीक है ? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस राहत का हकदार है ?

ज० पी० रत्न,
उप सचिव, हरियाणा सरकार,
श्रम विभाग।